

REMARKS

Claims 7-16 are presented for consideration, with Claims 7 and 11 being independent. Independent Claims 7 and 11 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art. In addition, Claims 15 and 16 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found, for example, on page 18, line 20, *et. seq.* of the specification and in Figure 5.

Claims 7, 8, 10-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Shih '122. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Shih '122 in view of Christensen '259. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 of Applicants' invention relates to a display apparatus comprised of a substrate comprising a metal layer, a display device disposed on the substrate, and a sensor portion for detecting a coordinate using electromagnetic induction. As amended, the sensor portion and the display device are disposed oppositely to each other with respect to the metal layer of the substrate. In addition, the metal layer of the substrate has an electromagnetic wave transmissive structure.

The primary citation to Shih relates to a touch control display screen as shown in Figure 1. The display screen includes, among other layers, a display screen 3, an induction layer 4, a shield layer 5, and screen control circuit 6, all disposed between a shell 1 and 7. The Office Action contends that shell 7 is comparable to Applicants' claimed substrate comprising a metal layer, and that induction layer 4 teaches the claimed sensor portion.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, Shih is not understood to teach or suggest, among other features, the sensor portion and the display device being disposed

oppositely to each other with respect to the metal layer of the substrate. In this regard, the Office Action asserts that the sensor portion, i.e., induction layer 4, is arranged on an opposite side of the substrate, i.e., shell 7, from the display device, i.e., display screen 3. As shown in Figure 1 of Shih, however, the display screen 3 and induction layer 4 are both provided on the same side of the substrate. Further, Shih is not understood to teach or suggest the shell 7 having an electromagnetic wave transmissive structure, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action.

The input apparatus set forth in Claim 11 relates to a substrate comprising a metal layer, a display device disposed on the substrate, and a pen which designates a position on a display surface of the display device and generates an electromagnetic wave locally at the designated position. As in Claim 7, the sensor portion and the display device are disposed oppositely to each other with respect to the metal layer of the substrate, with the metal layer having an electromagnetic wave transmissive structure. Claim 11 is thus also submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Shih does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 7 and 11, and thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Christensen relates to a woven polymer fiber video display and is cited for its teaching of a sheet of metal fiber. In Christensen a transparent substrate 11 can be formed of a transparent fiber material integrally woven with other fiber elements (see column 5, lines 59-61). Christensen fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Shih as discussed above. Accordingly, without conceding to the propriety of combining Shih and Christensen in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such a combination still fails to teach or suggest

Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 7 and 11 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 8-10 and 12-16 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/rnm